

**Draft Summary of the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
March 26, 2002**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted a meeting for the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group on March 26, 2002 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary:

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Attachment 1 | Meeting Agenda |
| Attachment 2 | Meeting Attendees |
| Attachment 3 | Flip Chart Notes |
| Attachment 4 | Interim Projects |
| Attachment 5 | Study Plan R-14: Assess Regional Recreation Barriers to Recreation |
| Attachment 6 | Study Plan R-17: Recreation Needs Analysis |

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations and the desired outcomes for the meeting were discussed. The meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Meeting flip chart notes are included as Attachment 3.

Action Items – February 28, 2002 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting

A summary of the February 28, 2002 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting is posted on the relicensing web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Action Item #R44: | Hold Task Force meetings to review and revise remaining Study Plans. |
| Status: | The participants were informed that the Task Force had met to review and revise remaining Study Plans. Further discussion on this action item was deferred until it was addressed as part of Agenda Item IV (Study Plan Task Force Update). Please refer to the discussion in the meeting summary below. |

Interim Projects Update

Dave Ferguson with DWR led a discussion on the status of interim recreation projects. He distributed a handout to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group that arranges the interim projects by category (see Attachment 4). The four interim project categories are: Category I, implement with minimum environmental review; Category II, requires involved environmental review, planning and design; Category III, needs further analysis, consider impacts on resources; and Category IV, on-going efforts, continue working group discussion. Dave explained that most projects included in Category I are currently going through the environmental review and will likely be processed as categorical exemptions under CEQA. Interim projects in other categories are in various stages of development.

One participant asked for more detail related to the interim recreation project to provide vehicle access at Lakeland Blvd. The participants were informed that DWR does not currently have an easement on the railroad property beside the existing roadway to allow access to the Diversion

Pool, but has requested one from Union Pacific. Dave indicated that the right-of-way issue has not yet been resolved and is currently being handled through DWR's Division of Land and Right of Way. Liability issues associated with formal access were discussed. Dave noted that if an easement is not granted to DWR, there is an alternative although more expensive plan to construct a new roadway to provide access to the Diversion Pool area.

Several participants expressed interest in developing boat launch facilities other than car-top launching with the Lakeland Boulevard access project. Other participants expressed concern with "illegal" bike trail use on this property due to the lack of an easement. Dave explained that DWR was asking for an additional easement to allow the bike trail to cross the railroad tracks. One participant expressed concern with grouping the bike trail crossing with the access easement because it could block completion of the access part. Dave assured her that the Lakeland Blvd. Access project is on schedule and should not be impacted by the request for the bike trail easement.

Steve Nachtman with the consulting team reminded the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group that all of the interim recreation projects are only recommendations and are not technically part of the relicensing process. As such, the interim project list is subject to modification if problematic issues arise. Harry Williamson representing the National Parks Service reinforced the fact that the interim recreation projects are not in FERC's purview and should not be the focus of the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group.

One participant was concerned that the considerable effort put into identifying and prioritizing interim recreation projects would be ignored and that these projects would not be considered in the study plans or the recreation plan to be developed. It was noted that the project issue tracking system would ensure that these prior work efforts and concerns would not be lost.

Study Plan Task Force Update

Doug Rischbieter, DWR's Resource Area Manager for the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group, updated participants on the Recreation and Socioeconomics Study Plan Task Force. The Task Force met once since the last Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting in February 2002. The main focus of the Task Force meeting was to review survey instruments and to address the JPA consultant's concerns with SP-R14 and SP-R17. The Task Force update on these two study plans was provided in the context of the study plan review presented below.

Doug reported that substantial progress has been made on developing the survey instruments that will be used to gather data for use in various study plans. He indicated that at this point, the survey instruments might be a bit too long which could pose implementation problems (e.g., lower response rates). The goal is to have survey instruments completed at the next Study Plan Task Force meeting on April 11, 2002 and subsequently approved at the next Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting in April. Steve Nachtman indicated that development of the survey format is an ongoing process and a variety of approaches may be used. However, he wanted to make it clear that there would not be the opportunity for major revisions or "wordsmithing" of the survey instrument at the next meeting due to schedule constraints. One or two participants voiced their opinion that study design should not be limited to traditional or accepted methods, but that the Work Group and consultants should consider new and different methods as appropriate. Harry Williamson wanted to acknowledge the excellent job the consulting team is doing in preparing survey instruments to answer the questions related to recreation at Oroville and suggested the participants defer to their expertise for survey question development.

The project schedule and data needs dictate that recreation surveys need to start in May 2002. In order to meet that schedule, standard pre-testing will need to happen before that. It was

suggested that some pre-testing of the survey instruments should occur at the next Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting by having participants take the surveys themselves.

One area of concern expressed with the survey questions is related to the inclusion of monetary-related questions. A participant suggested that people might be sensitive to questions about their income and spending habits and not want to answer them. Steve Nachtman with the consulting team explained that these questions are needed to support the economic studies (SP-R18 and SP-R19) and to understand the market for recreation visitors at Oroville. Steve also mentioned that any survey responses related to income and spending would be anonymous.

Doug Rischbieter clarified for the participants that we will have the opportunity to review Year 1 survey results and modify the methodology for Year 2 surveys if necessary. However, it was noted that the need for revisions in Year 2 surveys would not be based on undesirable results from Year 1, but rather on flawed methodology.

Study Plan (review and revise)

At its last meeting, the Study Plan Task Force revised study plans SP-R14 and SP-R17. The revised versions of these two study plans dated March 19, 2002, were distributed to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group (see Attachments 5 and 6, respectively). The Facilitator reported that her conversation with Pete Soderberg earlier in the day confirmed that the Dangermond Group's concerns associated with these study plans have been addressed. The Facilitator summarized the revisions made to the two study plans, which were highlighted in the distributed versions. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group made further minor revisions during this meeting. The Facilitator reminded the Work Group that the Plenary Group has approved all of the Recreation and Socioeconomics study plans pending no major revisions and Work Group approval.

Study Plan 17 (Recreation Needs Analysis)

Minor revisions were made to SP-R17, including grammatical edits where necessary. One participant asked who would be developing the trails plan that will ultimately be prepared using the information from the Needs Analysis reports. The Facilitator responded that the recreation plan to be submitted with the application to FERC, of which the trails plan would be a component, would be developed within the collaborative process utilizing input from all stakeholders and participants. She suggested that the notion of collaboratively drafted documents was central to the ALP process and has been set forth in several process documents. The participant requested clarification and the Facilitator agreed to research project documents to find references on how collaborative interaction will be used in the relicensing process.

One participant raised the issue of DPR's decision to designate their trails as multi-use. The Facilitator reported that FERC representatives are aware of this DPR decision that affects trails statewide and are reviewing it in the context of the existing FERC license. It was also noted that public agency management in the study area would be considered in one of the Land Use study plans so the decision will be reviewed within the context of land management activities within the Project boundary.

The participants discussed the iterative process surrounding the implementation of the study plans. One participant asked whether there would be local employment opportunities available for implementing study plans. In terms of the survey-related studies, Steve Nachtman indicated that there might be opportunities depending on qualifications. He explained that David Rolloff with the consulting team is leading the hiring effort for the implementation of the recreation surveys and will likely utilize some researchers attending Chico State University. There were some concerns voiced regarding the use of staff from the school and a desire expressed by one participant to see the process involve local people with local knowledge to assist in the study efforts. Steve clarified

that these researchers were not Chico State staff, but just happened to be students enrolled in their classes. Steve Nachtman will coordinate with David Roloff on this issue and will report back to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group at their April 2002 meeting. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to approve SP-R17.

Study Plan 14 (Assess Regional Recreation and Barriers to Recreation)

Minor revisions were made to SP-R14. One participant inquired whether the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group would have access to the DPR statewide survey, which is currently in the developmental stage. Doug Rischbieter informed the participants that this survey has not been deployed yet and no information from the survey would be available until 2003, but DWR will have access to this information as it is generated. Doug will consult with DPR regarding the availability of this data to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group.

The discussion on SP-R14 primarily focused on what sources of existing information should be included in Attachment A of the study plan. There were concerns with the use of any information derived from the Chico State study (Guthrie, et al., 1997), which is listed in Attachment A; it was concluded that only broad, regional information would be used from the Chico State study. New sources of information were added to Attachment A, including but not limited to, the DPR camping reservation system, Oroville Chamber of Commerce, marina concessionaires, ORAC minutes, LOSRA trail logs, Lake Oroville fishery evaluation report, and the Butte County library. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to approve SP-R14.

Next Steps

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Study Plan Task Force will further refine the recreation survey instruments developed for SP-R13 at its next meeting scheduled in April 2002. The survey(s) will then be administered to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group at the next, regularly scheduled Work Group meeting in April 2002.

Next Meetings

Recreation and Socioeconomics Task Force Meeting:

Date: Thursday, April 11, 2002

Time: 9:30am to 1pm

Location: State Water Contractors office (455 Capitol Mall, Room 220, Sacramento, (916) 447-7357)

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed on the following meeting date/time:

Date: Thursday, April 25, 2002

Time: 6pm to 10pm

Location: Kelly Ridge Golf Course Meeting Room

Agreements Made

1. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to approve SP-R14 and SP-R17 and acknowledge the Plenary Group's pre-approval of all Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group study plans.

Action Items

The following list of action items identified by the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item status.

Action Item #R45: Research project documents to find references on how collaborative interaction will be used in the relicensing process.

Responsible: Facilitator

Due Date: April 25, 2002

Action Item #R46: Coordinate with David Rolloff on potential to develop a formal hiring process to involve local residents in the recreation survey implementation process.

Responsible: Consulting team

Due Date: April 25, 2002

Action Item #R47: Consult with DPR on the availability of the 2002 statewide recreation survey data for use in the Work Group.

Responsible: Doug Rischbieter (DWR)

Due Date: April 25, 2002